1762. February 10. Smith against Douglas.

No 200.

A BILL had lain over for five years without diligence. It was found to have loft its privileges fo as not to exclude compensation against an onerous indorfer.

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 91.

See The particulars voce Compensation

1766. June 13.

[AMES WEEMYSS, Goldfmith in Edinburgh, against John M'NAUCHTON, Efq; Inspector General of the Customs.

No 201. Action refused on a bill which had lain over twenty-five years, the acceptor alive; but under refervation to infift for the acceptor's oath.

In July 1739, Mr M'Nauchton accepted a bill to Thomas Erskine for L. 25 Sterling, payable two months after date. This bill Mr Erskine indorfed to James Moncrief, who indorfed it to Mr Weemyss; who, in 1765, brought an action against M'Nauchton for payment of the bill.

The question came before Lord Pitsour, who made avisandum to the Court and appointed informations.

Pleaded for Weemys the pursuer: By the common law of the country, there is no fuch thing as prescription known. Every right, legally conflituted, subfifts for ever; but as, in process of time, this unlimited endurance of rights or obligations was found to be attended with many inconveniencies, the exception of prescription was introduced by the act 1469, whereby an action not exercised, for the space of 40 years, was elided; and afterwards the legislature thought it expedient, by special statutes, to introduce fundry shorter prescriptions, as the triennial prescription of accounts, the vicennial prescription of holograph writs, &c.

But there was no flatute limiting the prescription of bills, which must therefore fubfift for 40 years. In some cases, it is true, the Court has refused action on bills that have lain over for a shorter time; but such decisions proceeded always upon the prefumption of payment, and not upon the footing of prefcription. And the purfuer alleged, that there was no room for prefuming payment in this case, as the acceptor himself was alive, and did not condescend upon any particular time or place when payment was made.

Answered for M'Nauchton the defender: That, though no particular law has, in this country, limited the prescription of bills to a short endurance, yet the Court has been constantly in use of denying action upon them after a long taciturnity; which appears agreeable to Lord Stair's opinion, titled Probation by writ; and Lord Bankton, treating of Bills of Exchange; and fundry decisions were referred to, where the Court had refused action upon bills, that had lain over for a number of years, though not near the years of the long prescription;